UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/535,231	07/24/2006	Young Min Kim	430156.402USPC	5662	
	7590 11/13/2008 EED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC			EXAMINER	
701 FIFTH AVE			OUSPENSKI, ILIA I		
SUITE 5400 SEATTLE, WA 98104			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1644		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/13/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/535,231	KIM ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ILIA OUSPENSKI	1644
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESTRICTION OF THE MAILING	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 A This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-26 is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subjected to by the Examin 10) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 May 2005 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the	or election requirement. er. a) ⊠ accepted or b) □ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		, ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

1. The examiner of this application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI, Group Art Unit 1644, Technology Center 1600.

2. Claims 1 - 26 are pending.

Claims 14 – 26 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected Inventions/Species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 02/08/2008.

Claims 1 – 13 are presently under consideration.

3. Applicant's election of the following Species: glycosylated region as an Fc region; IgG4 Fc fragment as a specific Fc fragment; PEG as a specific non-peptide linker; and erythropoietin as a specific physiologically active polypeptide in the reply filed on 08/14/2008 is acknowledged. Because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election of species has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Art Unit: 1644

4. Receipt is acknowledged of foreign priority papers (Application No. 10-2003-0080299, Republic of Korea) submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers are of record in the file of the instant application.

- 5. Claim 5 is objected to because of an apparent typographical error in the word "arid."
- 6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of **35 U.S.C. 102** that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 7. Claims 1 13 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 102(e)** as being anticipated by DeFrees et al. (US Patent No. 7,125,843; see entire document).

DeFrees et al. teach conjugates comprising a peptide and an agent covalently linked via a linker (see e.g. the diagram at column 67). The agent may be an antibody (e.g. column 67 line 48), which inherently comprises an immunoglobulin Fc fragment, and the linker may be PEG (e.g. column 68 line 30). The peptide may be a biologically active polypeptide, including erythropoietin (e.g. Scheme 3 at columns 71 – 72, and Table 6 at column 190). DeFees et al. further teach pharmaceutical compositions comprising the conjugates (e.g. Figure 136 and description of the figure at column 30).

Therefore, the teachings of the reference anticipate the instant claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1644

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1 – 13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type **double patenting** as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 19 and 27 – 45 of copending Application No. 10/535232, published as US Pat. Pub. No. 2006/0269553. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are directed to the same or nearly the same polypeptide conjugates and compositions.

Art Unit: 1644

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. Conclusion: no claim is allowed.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI whose telephone number is (571)272-2920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen B. O'Hara can be reached on 571-272-0878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ILIA OUSPENSKI/
ILIA OUSPENSKI, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644

November 7, 2008